



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Occasionally an inaccuracy has been noted. Thus on i. 6. 3 the explanation of *nomine* as ablative of separation is certainly to be rejected. The only rational explanation of the word in the present instance is as an ablative of instrument. The expression *ab nomine* in i. 23. 3, cited by the editor, represents an entirely different conception and is chronologically later than the construction of the simple ablative.

The substructions referred to on i. 12. 6 cannot fairly be claimed as those of the Temple of Jupiter Stator. There is no evidence in favor of this view sufficient to warrant a positive statement.

The punctuation is faulty in two important instances in the Praefatio, viz. in 9 after *auctum imperium sit*, and in 10 after *intueri*. In both places a comma stands, where all other editors, in conformity with the sense, punctuate with the semicolon or colon. As the passages involved are of special difficulty, the oversight is likely to mislead the student.

An excellent introduction to the book is provided, touching upon Livy's life and the sources and style of his work, but one notes the lack of indexes at the close of the volume, although other books of the series, as Allen's *Annals of Tacitus* and Kellogg's *Brutus*, are furnished with these useful accompaniments.

The foregoing incidental strictures, however, are not of serious import. The book in its main features, as has already been indicated, has much to commend it, and will be gratefully received by classical teachers.

CHAS. E. BENNETT.

A Grammar of the Old Persian Language, with the Inscriptions of the Achæmenian Kings and Vocabulary, by HERBERT CUSHING TOLMAN, Ph. D. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1892.

According to the announcement of the publishers, "This is the first complete grammar of the language that has ever been published either in this country or in Europe," a statement which is hardly correct, unless greater stress is laid on the title than on the contents of a book. For the actual treatment of the grammar is much less complete than may be found in Bartholomæ's *Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekte* in conjunction with Avestan grammar, or together with the texts of the inscriptions in *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften* of Spiegel. It is especially with the last-named work, as covering essentially the same ground and being in its second edition the manual most used at present, that Dr. Tolman's book invites comparison. The latter contains as a special feature a full list of the verb-forms of Old Persian, and in the vocabulary comparisons are given from a larger field than is the case with Spiegel, who restricts himself to the Aryan languages. In other respects Spiegel's work is far more complete. This in itself is not necessarily to the disadvantage of Dr. Tolman's grammar. For example, we have no serious objection to a boiling down of Spiegel's detailed account of the discovery and decipherment of the inscriptions, interesting reading though it be, but think it rather curious that the author finds space to cite the article of Dr. Beer in the *Hallische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, 1838, and yet has not a word to say of the labors of Rawlinson in this field. But it is in the body of the work, the grammar, text and vocabulary, where we have a right to expect a great advance over

Spiegel, that we are disappointed to find rather a step backward. Spiegel's work was always weak in many particulars, and, moreover, in the ten years which have elapsed since the publication of his second edition, no small progress has been made in the interpretation of the text and the grammatical explanation of individual forms. The articles on the subject are scattered in various journals, and it is the first requirement of a new work of a general nature that it should take account of all such investigations and incorporate their results. Unfortunately, these recent investigations seem to be wholly unknown to our author. The vocabulary contains all the mistakes of Spiegel, even such as have long been recognized on all sides as absolutely absurd; for example, the reading *tum* instead of *tuam*. In the list of verb-forms and in the vocabulary we find a root *aj* = Skr. *aj* given, though the single form on the strength of which Spiegel sets this up—namely, *patiyajatā*—is to be referred to *jan* = Skr. *han*, and corresponds exactly to Skr. (*praty*)*ahata*, as was shown by Hübschmann, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, 23, p. 397, and rediscovered by Friedr. Müller, Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes, III, p. 148. Moreover, Dr. Tolman reads in his transcription of the text *Patiyajata*, as if it were a proper name, but we suppose this is merely a misprint. The existence of a root *khṣi* (*khshi*) is as precarious as that of *aj*, for the form *patiyakhṣi* is to be referred to the root *akhṣ* = Av. *akhṣ* 'see,' with *aiwi* 'oversee, rule.' It would require too much space to give all the instances in which recent investigations are ignored. In one case an old error which is corrected in Spiegel's second edition is retained by our author—namely, the reading of the name of Darius as *Dārayavu-š* instead of *Dārayava(h)u-š* (second element of the compound = Skr. *vasu*), as was first proposed by Lindner, Literar. Centralblatt, 1880, p. 358, and since adopted by both philologists and historians. With this reading the genitive singular (to be transcribed *Dārayavahauš*) ceases to be anomalous, and the note to declension III in the grammar might have been spared.

But the most reprehensible part of the book is the comparative portion of the vocabulary. Work of this kind must be well done if it is not to be more harmful than otherwise. We do not expect in these days every Sanskrit or Iranian scholar to be equally at home in the field of comparative philology, but we do have a right to demand that when one attempts a comparative vocabulary he should at least consult good authorities. The etymologies in Lanman's Sanskrit reader represented the best opinion of the time, and are so conservative that the number of changes necessary at the present time would be comparatively few. But how far back would one have to go to arrive at a period when such wonderful etymologies as the following would pass muster? *aita*: Lat. *iste*, Goth. *tha*, Eng. *the*. *aniya*: Lat. *alius*. *upa*: Germ. ob. *patiy*: Skr. *prati*, Zend *paiti*, "Lat. *re*, *red* as in *refero*, *reddo*; *prae*; *por*, *pol*, *pos* for *port*, as in *porrigo*, *pollus*, *possideo*." It would have been shorter and equally correct to say simply "every Lat. preposition containing either *p* or *r* or both." Under *bumi* 'ground, earth,' Skt. *bhūmi*, we find *humus* given as the Latin equivalent. To be sure, if one looks merely at outward resemblance, the connection of *humus* with *bumi* seems quite irresistible, with Av. *zēmō*, Gr. *χαμαί*, or Gothic *guma*, on the contrary, incredible, yet it is the latter connection only which can be justified by the phonological laws. Under *band* we find Lat. *filum*, *funis*, *pendo*; under *darš* = Skt. *dṛṣ* 'dare' is given Lat. *fortis*,

which, of course, can only be referred to Skr. *dṛh* 'make firm.' An interesting mosaic is the article "*aiva* 'one,' Skr. *eka*; Zend *æva*; Lat. *aequus*; Goth. *ha* in compounds, as *haihs* for *haiha* 'one-eyed,' *halts* for *ha-lta*, 'lame,' *halbs* for *ha-lba* 'half,' Eng. halt, half." It would be useless to enumerate more such instances. I have noted over twenty words for which the cognates given are partially or wholly wrong, and for such a limited vocabulary this is an inexcusably large proportion. Errors of omission which do less positive harm are not wanting. For example, the author follows Spiegel in giving a root *ras*, and seems unaware of the fact, first pointed out by Bartholomae, that this is nothing but the inchoative form of the root Skr. *ṛ*, *ar*, the form *rasatiy* corresponding exactly to Skr. *ṛcchāti*. Under *didā* 'castle' (better 'fortification') no cognate is given, though the word occurs in another ablaut form in Sanskrit (*dehī* 'wall'), German (*deich*) and English (*dike*), not to mention Gr. *τειχος*, *τοιχος*, Osc. *feihúss*, Armen. *dēz*. The general impression made by the 'grammar' is that the author has undertaken the work without adequate preparation. However, the price is low, and in the hands of a competent teacher the book might possibly be made of use.

CARL D. BUCK.